

REMARKS

Claims 29, 50, 64-69, 72-75, 78-80, and 82 are currently pending.

Claims 29, 50, 67, 72-75, 78-80, and 82 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvie (US 6,620,185) in view of Harwin et al (US 5618314). Specifically, the Examiner argues that Harvie discloses all of the limitations of independent claim 29, except for the claimed eyelet, pair of channels, or the cannula tip portion with flat areas. However, the Examiner argues that Harwin does teach these limitations and that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Harvie and Harwin to get the invention of independent claim 29.

Claim 29 specifies that the suture carrying device includes an eyelet configured to receive a portion of the suture and a pair of channels **extending from the eyelet**. Neither Harvie nor Harwin disclose this limitation either individually or together. Therefore, claim 29 is in condition for allowance and claims 50, 67, 72-75, 78-80, and 82, which depend from claim 29 either directly or indirectly, are also in condition for allowance. It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 64 and 66 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvie and Harwin in view of Doi et al (3,584,198). The Doi reference fails to cure the previously described deficiencies of the Harvie and Harwin references with respect to claim 29. Therefore, the combination of the Harvie, Harwin, and Doi references fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 29, from which claims 64 and 66 depend. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 29.

Claims 65, 68, and 69 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvie and Harwin in view of Lavenuta (US 6,660,554). The Lavenuta reference fails to cure the previously described deficiency of the Harvie and Harwin references with respect to claim 29. Therefore, the combination of the Harvie, Harwin, and Lavenuta references fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 29, from which claims 65, 68, and 69 depend. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.


Applicants do not acquiesce to the characterizations of the art. For brevity and to advance prosecution, however, Applicants may have not addressed all characterizations of the art, but reserve the right to do so in further prosecution of this or a subsequent application.

The absence of an explicit response by the Applicants to any of the Examiner's positions does not constitute a concession of the Examiner's positions. The fact that Applicants comments have focused on particular arguments does not constitute a concession that there are not other good arguments for patentability of the claims. All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons given with respect to the claims on which they depend.

Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 192563.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/18/09


Norman F. Hainer Jr.
Reg. No. 55,239

Smith & Nephew, Inc.
150 Minuteman Road
Andover, MA 01810
Telephone: (978) 749-1311
Facsimile: (978) 684-6417